



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/550,726	04/17/2000	Paul A. Revis	M00-031500	1485

22835 7590 10/27/2003

PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 SECOND STREET
SUITE 201
DAVIS, CA 95616

EXAMINER

LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/550,726

Applicant(s)

REVIS, PAUL A.

Examiner

Matthew J. Ludwig

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed 04/17/00.
2. Claims 1-45 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 30, and 38 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,457,026 filed (9/13/00).

In reference to independent claim 1, Graham teaches:

- An elongated thumbnail image of many pages, or all of document is presented in second viewing area. Document will typically be a multi-page document with a section being displayed in first viewing area (compared to "displaying a page in the website, the page including the line drawing version of the image"). See column 8, lines 33-40. Graham illustrates in Figure 2A, (as presently claimed), a proficient line drawing of the actual document image in a second window view.

- Within the elongated thumbnail image, an emphasized area shows a reduced view of the document section currently displayed in first window area with the reduction ratio preferably being user-configurable (compare to "wherein displaying the line drawing version of the graphical image requires less data to be retrieved than displaying the full bitmap version of the

Art Unit: 2178

image”). See column 8, 40-50. The reference does not explicitly state that the second window, which provides a reduced view of the document section currently displayed, requires less data to be retrieved; however, the reduced image taught by Graham, demonstrates a similar method as presently claimed. Thumbnails within a web environment require less data to be retrieved than displaying the full bitmap version of the actual image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have modified the methods taught by Graham and utilized the thumbnail techniques to give the user an efficient means of finding information anywhere in the document.

- User may scroll through document by sliding emphasized area up and down. As emphasized area shifts, the section of document displayed in first viewing area will also shift (compare to “user inputs the command to display the full bitmap version of the image” and “retrieving and displaying the full bitmap version of the image”). See column 8, lines 57-62. The reference demonstrates a similar technique of a user utilizing a mouse to input a command in a separate window and upon entering a command, the section of the document in the second document retrieving and displaying information based on the user’s input command.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Graham teaches:

Figure 6A shows that the source of document may be accessed via a network. Possible sources include e.g., the Internet, an intranet, a digital copier that captures document images, or other office equipment. See column 5, lines 17-24.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Graham teaches:

User may scroll through document by sliding emphasized area up and down. As emphasized area shifts, the section of document displayed in first viewing area will also shift. See column 8, lines 57-60.

In reference to dependent claim 4, Graham teaches:

An elongated thumbnail image of many pages, or all of document is presented in second viewing area. Document will typically be a multi-page document with a section being displayed in first viewing area. See column 33-39. The reference demonstrates two separate windows consisting of two different sets of images within pages of a document.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Graham teaches:

Elongated thumbnail image provides a convenient view of the basic document structure. The annotations incorporated into the document are visible within elongated thumbnail images. See column 8, lines 37-41.

In reference to dependent claim 6, the claim recites similar limitations to those of independent claim 1, and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to dependent claim 7, Graham teaches:

Figure 6A shows that the source of document may be accessed via a network. Possible sources include e.g., the Internet, an intranet, a digital copier that captures document images, or other office equipment. See column 5, lines 17-24.

In reference to claims 8-14, the claims recite the computer executable instructions for carrying out the methods of claims 1-7, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to claims 15-21, the claims recite the apparatus for carrying out the methods of claims 1-7, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

In reference to independent claim 22, Graham teaches:

Elongated thumbnail image displays each page of document as being displayed at the same reduced scale. An elongate thumbnail image of many pages, or all of document is presented in second viewing area. See column 8, lines 32-67. The reference demonstrates the utilization of images within a document and thumbnails that are produced from the original images within the structure of a document.

The reference does not explicitly state that the second window, which provides a reduced view of the document section currently displayed, requires less data to be retrieved; however, the reduced image taught by Graham, demonstrates a similar method as presently claimed.

Thumbnails within a web environment require less data to be retrieved than displaying the full bitmap version of the actual image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have modified the methods taught by Graham and utilized the thumbnail techniques to give the user an efficient means of finding information anywhere in the document.

In reference to dependent claim 23, Graham teaches:

An elongate thumbnail image of many pages, or all of document is presented in second viewing area. Document will typically be a multi-page document with a section being displayed in first viewing area. See column 8, lines 33-40. Figure 6A shows that the source of document may be accessed via a network. Possible sources include e.g., the Internet, an intranet, a digital copier that captures document images, or other office equipment. See column 5, lines 17-24.

In reference to dependent claim 24, Graham teaches:

User may scroll through document by sliding emphasized area up and down. As emphasized area shifts, the section of document displayed in first viewing area will also shift (compare to "user inputs the command to display the full bitmap version of the image" and "retrieving and displaying the full bitmap version of the image"). See column 8, lines 57-62. The reference demonstrates a similar technique of a user utilizing a mouse to input a command in a separate window and upon entering a command, the section of the document in the second document retrieving and displaying information based on the user's input command. In reference to dependent claims 25-29, the claims recite similar limitations to the methods of claims 1-7, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale. In reference to claims 30-45, the limitations recite the computer executable instructions followed by the apparatus for carrying out the methods of claims 22-29, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Angiulo et al.,	US Patent No. 6,275,829	filed (11/25/97)
-----------------	-------------------------	------------------

Manolis et al.,	US Patent No. 6,583,799	filed (11/29/99)
-----------------	-------------------------	------------------

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 703-305-8043. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

ML

October 17, 2003


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100